Tom Henzinger IST Austria

Joint work with Guy Avni (University of Haifa) et al.

Graph Games

Theory:

-connections to logic and automata -fundamental complexity questions

Applications:

-well-formedness (realizability, compatibility) of open specifications -reasoning about multi-agent systems (ATL) -sequential synthesis, discrete-event control, and AI planning

Graph Games

- finite set Q of labeled nodes = system states
 - directed edges = state transitions
 - players Max, Min = decision agents
 - outcome $w \in Q^* \cup Q^{\omega}$ = finite or infinite path

objective $\varphi: Q^{\omega} \rightarrow Bool \cup Real = qualitative or quantitative specification$

Objectives

Reachability:

given target $T \subseteq Q$, $\phi(w) = \} T(w) = \exists i. w(i) \in T$

1	Objectives
2	
3	Reachability:
4	rteachability.
2	given target $T \subseteq Q$,
3	$\varphi(w) = $ T(w) = $\exists i. w(i) \in T$
2	
3	Parity:
4	given priority labels p: $Q \rightarrow Nat$.
2	$\phi(w) = 1$ if max { p : $\exists^{\infty}i. p=p(w(i))$ } is odd
3	$\varphi(w) = 0$ else
2	
3	
4	
÷	

1	Obiectives	1	1
2		.1	0
3	Deeebebility	· 1 ·	U 1/3
4	Reachability:	2	3/4
2	given target $T \subset Q$.	-1	2/5
3	$\varphi(w) = T(w) = \exists i. w(i) \in T$:	:
2		•	•
3	Parity:		
4	given priority labels p: O Nat		
2	$\omega(w) = 1$ if max { p : $\exists^{\infty}i$, p=p(w(i)) } is odd		
3	$\varphi(w) = 0$ else		
2			
3	Mean payoff:	larg	jest
4		eve	ntual
:	given payoff labels p: $\mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{Nat}$, $\varphi(\mathbf{w}) = liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} 1/n \cdot \sum_{0 \le i \le n} p(\mathbf{w}(i))$	bou	er Ind

How to Generate a Path

- 1. Turn-based
- 2. Stochastic
- 3. Concurrent
- 4. Bidding



Asynchronous interaction of players:





Asynchronous interaction of players:



player Max chooses outgoing edge player Min chooses outgoing edge

 \mathbf{q}_0



 q_0 q_2

Asynchronous interaction of players:





Asynchronous interaction of players:





Asynchronous interaction of players:





Asynchronous interaction of players:





state q 2 Q positional strategies x,y: Q ! Q (x,y)@q: path in Q!

 $q_3((x,y)@q_0) = 1$



state q 2 Q pure strategies x,y: Q^{*} ! Q (x,y)@q: path in Q!

 $q_3((x,y)@q_0) = 1$



state q 2 Q mixed strategies x,y: Q^{*} ! D(Q) (x,y)@q: probability space on Q[!]

 $Pr(\{ q_3 \}) ((x,y)@q_0) = 1$

Winning

Values at state q:

maxwin(q) = $\exists x. \forall y. \phi((x,y)@q)$ for pure strategies, qualitative ϕ = $sup_x inf_y \phi((x,y)@q)$ for pure strategies, quantitative ϕ

 $\begin{aligned} \mathsf{maxval}(\mathsf{q}) &= \mathsf{sup}_{\mathsf{x}} \mathsf{inf}_{\mathsf{y}} \mathsf{Pr}(\varphi) \left((\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}) @ \mathsf{q} \right) \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{qualitative} \ \varphi \\ &= \mathsf{sup}_{\mathsf{x}} \mathsf{inf}_{\mathsf{y}} \mathsf{Exp}(\varphi) \left((\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}) @ \mathsf{q} \right) \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{quantitative} \ \varphi \end{aligned}$

Winning

Values at state q:

maxwin(q) = $\exists x. \forall y. \phi((x,y)@q)$ for pure strategies, qualitative ϕ = $sup_x inf_y \phi((x,y)@q)$ for pure strategies, quantitative ϕ

 $\begin{aligned} \mathsf{maxval}(\mathsf{q}) &= \mathsf{sup}_{\mathsf{x}} \mathsf{inf}_{\mathsf{y}} \mathsf{Pr}(\varphi) \left((\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}) @ \mathsf{q} \right) \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{qualitative} \ \varphi \\ &= \mathsf{sup}_{\mathsf{x}} \mathsf{inf}_{\mathsf{y}} \mathsf{Exp}(\varphi) \left((\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}) @ \mathsf{q} \right) \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{quantitative} \ \varphi \end{aligned}$

minwin(q) = $\exists y. \forall x. \neg \phi((x,y)@q)$ minval(q) = $\inf_{y} \sup_{x} Pr(\phi) ((x,y)@q)$

Winning

Values at state q:

maxwin(q) = $\exists x. \forall y. \phi((x,y)@q)$ for pure strategies, qualitative ϕ = $\sup_x inf_y \phi((x,y)@q)$ for pure strategies, quantitative ϕ

 $\begin{aligned} \mathsf{maxval}(\mathsf{q}) &= \mathsf{sup}_{\mathsf{x}} \mathsf{inf}_{\mathsf{y}} \mathsf{Pr}(\varphi) \left((\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}) @ \mathsf{q} \right) \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{qualitative} \ \varphi \\ &= \mathsf{sup}_{\mathsf{x}} \mathsf{inf}_{\mathsf{y}} \mathsf{Exp}(\varphi) \left((\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}) @ \mathsf{q} \right) \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{quantitative} \ \varphi \end{aligned}$

minwin(q) = $\exists y. \forall x. \neg \varphi((x,y)@q)$ minval(q) = $\inf_{y} \sup_{x} Pr(\varphi) ((x,y)@q)$

Determinacy:

 $\forall q. maxwin(q) = 1 - minwin(q)$ $\forall q. maxval(q) = minval(q) = val(q)$

Stochastic Game Graph



Stochastic Game Graph



Determined for positional strategies: val in NP \cap coNP for parity and mean-payoff.

Stochastic Game Graph



Determined for positional strategies: val in NP \cap coNP for parity and mean-payoff.

Concurrent Game Graph



Synchronous interaction of players:

-player Max moves {1,2}-player Min moves {1,2}

Concurrent Game Graph



Synchronous interaction of players:

-player Max moves {1,2} -player Min moves {1,2} Not determined for pure strategies.

Concurrent Game Graph



state q 2 Q
strategies x,y: Q* ! D(Moves)
(x,y)@q: probability space on Q!

 $\begin{aligned} x(q_0) &= 2 \\ y(q_0) &= \{1: 0.4; 2: 0.6\} \\ Pr(\} q_4) ((x,y)@q_0) &= 0.6 \end{aligned}$

"Matching Pennies"



"Matching Pennies"



Max can use randomness to win:

maxwin(} win@ q_0) = 0 for pure strategies val(} win@ q_0) = 1 for mixed strategies

Matrix Game Graph



player Min

player Max

2 1 **q**₀: q₁: 0.1 q₁: 0.3 q₂: 0.2 q₂: 0.1 1 q₃: 0.5 q₃: 0.5 q₄: 0.3 q₄: q₁: 1.0 **q**₁: q₂: 0.2 q₂: 2 q₃: 0.1 **q**₃: q₄: 0.7 **q**₄:

Matrix game at each node. Mixed determinacy.

Each player has a budget. At each node, each player bids part of their budget. The winning player chooses the outgoing edge.

Each player has a budget. At each node, each player bids part of their budget. The winning player chooses the outgoing edge.

Combination of graph games and algorithmic game theory.

Each player has a budget. At each node, each player bids part of their budget. The winning player chooses the outgoing edge.

Combination of graph games and algorithmic game theory.

Technical challenge: infinitely many possible moves -budgets and bids are real numbers -strategy: $(Q \times Real \times Real)^* \rightarrow D(Real) \times D(Q)$

Bidding Modes

Current budgets: Bmax, Bmin Current bids: maxbid, minbid; case maxbid > minbid

Richman bidding (David R. Richman 1980s):

New Max budget: New Min budget:

Bmax – maxbid Bmin + maxbid

Bidding Modes

Current budgets: Bmax, Bmin Current bids: maxbid, minbid; case maxbid > minbid

Richman bidding (David R. Richman 1980s):

New Max budget: New Min budget:

Bmax – maxbid Bmin + maxbid

"Poorman" bidding (Andrew J. Lazarus et al. 1990s):

New Max budget: New Min budget:

Bmax – maxbid Bmin

Bidding Modes

Current budgets: Bmax, Bmin Current bids: maxbid, minbid; case maxbid > minbid

Richman bidding (David R. Richman 1980s):

New Max budget: New Min budget:

Bmax – maxbid Bmin + maxbid

"Poorman" bidding (Andrew J. Lazarus et al. 1990s):

New Max budget: New Min budget:

Bmax – maxbid Bmin

All-pay bidding:

New Max budget: New Min budget:

Bmax – maxbid Bmin – minbid

Applications

-repeated, stateful auctions (first-price; second-price similar)

-poorman: pay for services with limited capacity; for being scheduled or routed (cloud, network, blockchain)

-all-pay: allocate bounded resources that are being consumed (military reserves, replacements in team sports)

-Richman: decentralized arbitration between different providers

"Win Twice in a Row"



Which bidding mode does player Max prefer?


























Richman:	3
Poorman:	2













Richman:3Poorman:2All-pay: $Bmax@q_0 > 2: Max wins$















Thm [Avni, Ibsen-Jensen, Tkadlec]: With all-pay bidding, for all $n \in Nat$, if Bmax@q₀ \in [1+1/(n+1), 1+1/n], then val(} q₃@q₀)=1/(n+1).

Richman and Poorman

- 1. Reachability
- 2. Parity
- 3. Mean-payoff



How much initial budget $Bmax@q_0$ does player Max need to win $\{q_3, ?\}$



How much initial budget Bmax@ q_0 does player Max need to win } q_3 ?



How much initial budget Bmax@ q_0 does player Max need to win } q_3 ?



How much initial budget Bmax@ q_0 does player Max need to win } q_3 ?



Threshold budget ratio R@q: player Max wins if Bmax > R; else player Min wins.

Thm [Lazarus et al.]: threshold budget ratios exist for reachability.



Threshold budget ratio R@q: player Max wins if Bmax > R; else player Min wins.

Thm [Lazarus et al.]: threshold budget ratios exist for reachability.



Threshold budget ratio R@q: player Max wins if Bmax > R; else player Min wins.

Thm [Lazarus et al.]: threshold budget ratios exist for reachability.



Threshold budget ratio R@q: player Max wins if Bmax > R; else player Min wins.

Thm [Lazarus et al.]: threshold budget ratios exist for reachability.



Threshold budget ratio R@q: player Max wins if Bmax > R; else player Min wins.

Thm [Lazarus et al.]: threshold budget ratios exist for reachability.



Threshold budget ratio R@q: player Max wins if Bmax > R; else player Min wins.

Thm [Lazarus et al.]: threshold budget ratios exist for reachability.
Richman Reachability



Threshold budget ratio R@q: player Max wins if Bmax > R; else player Min wins.

Thm [Lazarus et al.]: threshold budget ratios exist for reachability.

What is the threshold budget ratio for player Max to win $\{q_3, ?\}$

Richman Reachability



Threshold budget ratio B@q: player Max wins if Bmax > R; else player Min wins.

Thm [Lazarus et al.]: threshold budget ratios exist for reachability.

What is the threshold budget ratio for player Max to win $\{q_3, ?\}$









Poorman Reachability



Threshold budget ratio R@q: player Max wins if Bmax/(Bmax+Bmin) > R; else player Min wins.

Poorman Reachability



Threshold budget ratio R@q: player Max wins if Bmax/(Bmax+Bmin) > R; else player Min wins.

Thm [Lazarus et al.]: threshold budget ratios exist for reachability, but may be irrational.

Poorman Reachability



Threshold budget ratio R@q: player Max wins if Bmax/(Bmax+Bmin) > R; else player Min wins.

Thm [Lazarus et al.]: threshold budget ratios exist for reachability, but may be irrational.

No equivalence with random-turn games.

Richman and Poorman Parity

Richman and poorman (indeed, "taxman") parity is no harder than reachability, because in each bottom strongly connected component of the game graph, the largest priority (odd or even) determines the winner.

Richman and Poorman Parity

Richman and poorman (indeed, "taxman") parity is no harder than reachability, because in each bottom strongly connected component of the game graph, the largest priority (odd or even) determines the winner.

Finding threshold budget ratios for Richman parity is in NP \cap coNP (via the equivalence with random-turn games); poorman parity is in PSPACE (via the existential theory of the reals).

Richman and Poorman Parity

Richman and poorman (indeed, "taxman") parity is no harder than reachability, because in each bottom strongly connected component of the game graph, the largest priority (odd or even) determines the winner.

Finding threshold budget ratios for Richman parity is in NP \cap coNP (via the equivalence with random-turn games); poorman parity is in PSPACE (via the existential theory of the reals).

Tight complexity bounds are open for both Richman (between P and simple stochastic games) and poorman (between P and the existential theory of the reals) reachability and parity.

Richman and Poorman Mean-Payoff

Main result:

Unlike for qualitative objectives, for mean-payoff objectives, an equivalence with random-turn games holds in both the Richman and the poorman case.

Richman and Poorman Mean-Payoff

Main result:

Unlike for qualitative objectives, for mean-payoff objectives, an equivalence with random-turn games holds in both the Richman and the poorman case.

In the strongly-connected Richman case, the initial budget ratio does not matter, and the corresponding random-turn games are uniform.

Richman and Poorman Mean-Payoff

Main result:

Unlike for qualitative objectives, for mean-payoff objectives, an equivalence with random-turn games holds in both the Richman and the poorman case.

In the strongly-connected Richman case, the initial budget ratio does not matter, and the corresponding random-turn games are uniform.

In the strongly-connected poorman case, the corresponding random-turn games are biased by the initial budget ratio.

"Bowtie"



Player Min tries to minimize mean payoff (always chooses right node). Player Max tries to maximize mean payoff (always chooses left node).

"Bowtie"



Player Min tries to minimize mean payoff (always chooses right node). Player Max tries to maximize mean payoff (always chooses left node).

"Bowtie"



Player Min tries to minimize mean payoff (always chooses right node). Player Max tries to maximize mean payoff (always chooses left node).

What is the threshold budget ratio for player Min to achieve val ≤ 0 ?

Which bidding modes do the players prefer?



Value of strongly-connected game is 0 independent of initial budgets.



Value of strongly-connected game is 0 independent of initial budgets.

Optimal strategy for player Min: remember multiset M of winning Max bids so far; bid largest member of M and remove it from M if winning; if M is empty, bid 0.

- -1 Ø
- +1 1/17
- -1 Ø
- +1 1/31
- +1 1/29,1/31
- +1 1/11,1/29,1/31
- -1 1/29,1/31
- +1 1/9,1/29,1/31
- **-1** 1/29,1/31
- **-1** 1/31
- -1 Ø

Value of strongly-connected game is 0 independent of initial budgets.

Optimal strategy for player Min: remember multiset M of winning Max bids so far; bid largest member of M and remove it from M if winning; if M is empty, bid 0.



- **-1** Ø
- +1 1/17
- -1 Ø
- +1 1/31
- +1 1/29,1/31
- +1 1/11,1/29,1/31
- -1 1/29,1/31
- +1 1/9,1/29,1/31
- **-1** 1/29,1/31
- **-1** 1/31
- **-1** Ø

Value of strongly-connected game is 0 independent of initial budgets.

Optimal strategy for player Min: remember multiset M of winning Max bids so far; bid largest member of M and remove it from M if winning; if M is empty, bid 0.

Either M infinitely often empty, or size of M bounded.



Poorman "Bowtie"



Initial budget ratio 1/2 for player Min: optimal Min strategy same as before; then val ≤ 0 .

Poorman "Bowtie"



Initial budget ratio 1/2 for player Min: optimal Min strategy same as before; then val ≤ 0 .

Initial budget ratio 2/3 for player Min: add each winning Max bid twice to M; then val \leq -1/3.

Poorman "Bowtie"



Initial budget ratio 1/2 for player Min: optimal Min strategy same as before; then val ≤ 0 .

Initial budget ratio 2/3 for player Min: add each winning Max bid twice to M; then val \leq -1/3.

Value of strongly-connected game depends on initial budgets.











Richman = poorman with equal initial budgets

Which bidding modes do the players prefer?



Player with larger initial budget prefers poorman; player with smaller initial budget prefers Richman.

Equal initial budgets: both modes are equivalent.

Much left to do

"Inverse" problems:

What is the threshold budget for reaching a target with a given probability? What is the threshold budget for achieving a given mean payoff?

"Single-currency" problems: What happens if payoffs and budgets are linked (i.e., budgets can be recharged)?

"Non-zerosum" problems: What happens if players have objectives that are not dual? If there are more than 2 players?

Discrete Bids

If budgets and bids are integers (rather than reals), bidding games are a special case of concurrent games.

Discrete Bids

If budgets and bids are integers (rather than reals), bidding games are a special case of concurrent games.

Tie-breaking becomes critical.

Some tie-breaking mechanisms ensure determinacy (e.g., round-robin, fair coin); others don't (e.g., whether or not the first bidding results in a tie determines which player wins all ties).

References

Richman bidding: Avni, H, Chonev; JACM 2019 Poorman bidding: Avni, H, Ibsen-Jensen; WINE 2018 Taxman bidding: Avni, H, Zikelic; MFCS 2019 Discrete bidding: Aghajohari, Avni, H; CONCUR 2019 All-pay bidding: Avni, Ibsen-Jensen, Tkadlec; AAAI 2020

Thank you!